

Responses to Comment Letters and E-mail Comments from the General Public

This section provides responses to comments received on the IS/EA from the general public.

Summary of Comment Letters and E-mail Comments Received from the General Public			
Comment Code	Commenter Name	Date Letter Received	Appendix G Page No.
GP-1	Gabriella Owens	10/24/17	22
GP-2	Rebecca Carpenter	10/26/17	23
GP-3	James Sanders	10/29/17	24
GP-4	George Tash	11/03/17	25
GP-5	Gary Hartung	11/07/17	26
GP-6	Steve LaRochelle	11/17/17	27
GP-7	Terry Hodgins	11/17/17	28
GP-8	Chris Lazenby	11/21/17	29 – 30
GP-9	J. Paul Kozak	11/30/17	31
GP-10	Chris Lazenby	12/01/17	32
GP-11	Danny Estrada	12/01/17	33 – 34

**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse.Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar.T@DOT](mailto:Moreno.Cesar.T@DOT)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 118 widening - soundwall #5  
**Date:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 11:28:33 AM

Susan Tse

**From:** Gabriella Owens <[spoiledgrrapes@att.net](mailto:spoiledgrrapes@att.net)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 11:43:19 AM  
**To:** Tse, Susan@DOT  
**Subject:** 118 widening - soundwall #5

Good Morning Susan,

My neighbors and I have received your letter regarding the widening of the 118. Our stretch of the 118 – where soundwall #5 is proposed - has needed a soundwall for many decades.

There was one scheduled before the third lane was added, but it wasn’t done because of the economy. When the grove of trees along this stretch died because the watering system broke in the 1994 earthquake and was never fixed, the sound became worse. (They planted new trees – but most have died due to lack of water.)

When they built the soundwall on the west side of the freeway it reflected more noise to the east side. When they added the 4<sup>th</sup> lane using Federal funds, again a soundwall should have been required, but wasn’t done for the area East of Tapo Canyon that was part of the project. (We had to put up with construction equipment idling behind us at all hours of the night for an incredibly long time!)

We want to make sure that this time Caltrans will finally do what they should have done years ago and put up the soundwall (soundwall #5 in this project) along this part of the 118.

Regarding the chart on page 183 of the Environmental Assessment, does the column “Number of Benefitted Receivers” indicate the number of people who will benefit from the soundwall? If so, it is grossly underestimated. Disturbing levels of freeway noise extend for at least a block from the freeway and just my little street has more residents than the number listed in the chart.

What can the residents of my neighborhood do to help ensure soundwall #5 is built the full length of the 118 East between Tapo Canyon and Sycamore? Which public officials should we contact? City, County, State and/or Federal? What information should be included in letters or emails?

*Thanks,*  
*Gabriella*  
[Email: SpoiledGrrapes@att.net](mailto:SpoiledGrrapes@att.net)

**Response(s) to Comment GP-1**  
**Gabriella Owens**

As part of the proposed project, a soundwall is proposed along the edge of shoulder on the eastbound SR-118 from Galena Ave. to Tapo Canyon Road. This proposed 12 ft. high soundwall is predicted to provide 5 – 8 decibels of noise reduction to the impacted areas south of SR-118.

Please note that, based on research, trees do not provide a noticeable noise reduction unless they are about 100 ft. deeply dense and at least 15 ft. above the line of sight. Generally, the trees provide an “out of sight, out of mind” psychological benefit, but not an acoustic benefit.

The phrase “benefitted receivers” in the fourth column of Table 41 Summary of Acoustically Feasible Soundwalls indicates the number of dwelling units or homes that are predicted to receive a noise reduction of at least 5 dBA from the proposed soundwall. This is solely based on the traffic noise modeling. So while many other homes will benefit from having the soundwall (3-4 dBA noise reduction), only about 65 homes would meet the 5 dBA noise reduction requirement to be considered “acoustically benefited”. A 5 dBA noise reduction is considered to be readily perceptible while a 3 dBA change is considered barely noticeable. A difference in 10 dBA is considered doubling or halving of noise.

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is the funding agency for this widening project. Noise abatement measures have been considered and proposed in the form of sound walls because of the noise impacts created by this project. VCTC is also the funding agency for the retrofit sound wall projects, in which only sound walls are designed and constructed for qualified residential areas.

**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse.Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar I@DOT](mailto:Moreno.Cesar_I@DOT)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Letter of widening 118 and building soundwall  
**Date:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 11:27:29 AM

---

Susan Tse

---

**From:** fisherkitty5@aol.com <fisherkitty5@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:20:46 AM  
**To:** Tse, Susan@DOT  
**Subject:** Re: Letter of widening 118 and building soundwall

Good Morning Susan,

I received the letter about the widening of the 118 and building of sound walls. My backyard backs up to the 118 on the South side in between the exits of Sycamore Drive and Erringer Road. I'm hoping that I will finally get a Sound wall after all the years of living here. Can you confirm that?  
Thank you.

Rebecca Carpenter  
2587 N. Justin Ave.  
Simi Valley, Ca. 93065

**Response(s) to Comment GP-2**  
**Rebecca Carpenter**

Yes, as part of the proposed project, a soundwall is proposed along the edge of shoulder on the eastbound SR-118 between Erringer Road and Sycamore Drive. This proposed 12 ft. high soundwall is predicted to provide 7 – 8 decibels of noise reduction to adjacent residences south of SR-118.

A 5 dBA noise reduction is considered to be readily perceptible while a 3 dBA change is considered barely noticeable. A difference in 10 dBA is considered doubling or halving of noise.

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is the funding agency for this widening project. Noise abatement measures have been considered and proposed in the form of sound walls because of the noise impacts created by this project. VCTC is also the funding agency for the retrofit sound wall projects, in which only sound walls are designed and constructed for qualified residential areas.

**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse,Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar I@DOT](mailto:Moreno,Cesar_I@DOT)  
**Subject:** FW: 118 Construction project  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 1, 2017 3:06:43 PM

---

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you and have a good day!

SUSAN TSE, MPH, MS  
Senior Environmental Planner

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION-DISTRICT 7  
Division of Environmental Planning  
100 S. Main Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA, 90012  
Telephone: (213) 897-1821  
Fax: (213) 897-0685

-----Original Message-----  
From: James Sanders [<mailto:fxdgrnd@pacbell.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2017 2:56 PM  
To: Tse, Susan@DOT <[susan.tse@dot.ca.gov](mailto:susan.tse@dot.ca.gov)>  
Subject: 118 Construction project

I received a notice about freeway widening. I live on Marilyn St between Sycamore and Erringer Rd. My backyard is the freeway. Will be finally be getting a soundwall? If so when will it be installed? A couple years ago we got a guard rail. That is no where near enough to cut down on the ever increasing sound of the freeway.

Thank you  
James Sanders

**Response(s) to Comment GP-3**  
**James Sanders**

As part of the proposed project, a soundwall is proposed along the edge of shoulder on the eastbound SR-118 between Erringer Road and Sycamore Drive. This proposed 12 ft. high soundwall is predicted to provide 7 – 8 decibels of noise reduction to adjacent residences south of SR-118.

A 5 dBA noise reduction is considered to be readily perceptible while a 3 dBA change is considered barely noticeable. A difference in 10 dBA is considered doubling or halving of noise.

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is the funding agency for this widening project. Noise abatement measures have been considered and proposed in the form of sound walls because of the noise impacts created by this project. VCTC is also the funding agency for the retrofit sound wall projects, in which only sound walls are designed and constructed for qualified residential areas.

## *George and Debra Tash*

5777 Balcom Canyon Rd.  
Somis Ca 93066  
voice mail: (805)529-8108  
cell: (805)432-4701  
e-mail: debratash@gmail.com

Mrs. Susan Tse, Senior Environmental Planner  
California Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning (SR-118 Widening Project)  
100 South Main Street MS 16A  
Los Angeles CA 90012

Dear Mrs. Tse:

RE: NOA, State Route 188 Widening Project

I am in receipt of your October 16, 2017 Notice to adopt a Negative Declaration for the above referenced project. I wholeheartedly support your plans. The two lanes east/westbound on the route are, indeed, a bottleneck. Traffic queues up at peak hours, and even off peak hours, creating a hazard as well as delays to the commuters using the 118/23 Freeways.

What I do want to bring forth is the amount of noise from the freeway. We have a home at 3900 Brennan Road Moorpark which is just off Tierra Rejada and the 23 Freeway. The project quite understandably will create even more traffic and therefore increase the noise, which even at present levels is nearly unbearable at times. We are asking that a sound wall be included from Tierra Rejada, where it presently ends just north of the crossing to 600 feet beyond the on ramp.

I do intend on being at the November 16<sup>th</sup> meeting and hope to speak with you at that time about my concerns. You can reach me at the above email addresses or the cell number.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

George Tash

### **Response(s) to Comment GP-4 George Tash**

Unfortunately, the limits of this project are up to just south of the New Los Angeles Avenue on the SR-23, which is about a mile north of your residence – located south of Tierra Rejada. As such, we regret to inform you that your residence would not be considered for identifying potential noise impacts under this project.



**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse,Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar J@DOT](mailto:Moreno,Cesar.J@DOT); [Laurel, Christopher@DOT](mailto:Laurel,Christopher@DOT)  
**Subject:** Fwd: widening of 118 & 23 freeways in Simi Valley & Moorpark , widening of 101 freeway From City of Ventura through Thousand Oaks  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 07, 2017 5:39:11 PM

See email below. Is anyone from vctc going?

Susan Tse

From: Kosinski, Ron J@DOT <[ron.kosinski@dot.ca.gov](mailto:ron.kosinski@dot.ca.gov)>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2017 5:31 PM  
Subject: RE: widening of 118 & 23 freeways in Simi Valley & Moorpark , widening of 101 freeway From City of Ventura through Thousand Oaks  
To: gary hartung <[hikersierras@yahoo.com](mailto:hikersierras@yahoo.com)>  
Cc: Tse, Susan@DOT <[susan.tse@dot.ca.gov](mailto:susan.tse@dot.ca.gov)>

Thank you we will see you on Nov 16<sup>th</sup>

**From:** gary hartung [ gary hartung <mailto:hikersierras@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 07, 2017 1:19 PM  
**To:** Kosinski, Ron J@DOT <[ron.kosinski@dot.ca.gov](mailto:ron.kosinski@dot.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** widening of 118 & 23 freeways in Simi Valley & Moorpark , widening of 101 freeway From City of Ventura through Thousand Oaks

Hello Mr. Kosinski,  
The widening of the 118 & 23 freeways through Simi Valley & Moorpark is profoundly stupid. The 118, 23 , 405, & 101 freeways are PACKED FROM 6AM - 9AM , and FROM 4PM - 6PM Monday - Friday with motorists driving to & from work. Many of these motorists drive from Simi Valley, Moopark, Fillmore, Thousand Oaks, Agoura, Calabassas, Camarillo, to the City of Ventura, San Fernando Valley, downtown Los Angeles. Cars CREEP ALONG !! at 15 - 30 mph for over an hour. Additional freeway lanes are not needed anywhere in California. There are two answers to reducing gridlock. Build Park & Ride lots in neighboring communities that can accommodate hundreds of cars along with dozens of buses transporting people to spots near their work places. These buses should carry maybe 100 people or more. When they arrive near worksites these people should be able to board smaller buses that can drop them off at a spot that is within a 10 minute walking time to their workplace. These buses should be electric powered to drasitically reduce air pollution. Thousands of bus drivers would be hired. Road repair costs would be drastically reduced.

I am looking forward to attending the Nov 16, 6 - 8 PM meeting at the Simi Valley City Council Chambers.

Sincerely Yours, Gary Hartung, Simi Valley,[hikersierras@yahoo.com](mailto:hikersierras@yahoo.com)

Response(s) to Comment GP-5  
Gary Hartung

Thank you for your comment and suggestions. The purpose of the project is to provide traffic congestion relief, improve traffic operation, and accommodate projected traffic volumes. The need for the proposed project is based on an assessment of the existing and future transportation demand in the project area compared to available capacity. The implementation of either of the two Build Alternatives could be expected to improve the operational capacity, and consequently the safety service level, for SR-118 and SR-23 within and beyond the project limits.

There are seven Park and Ride facilities (five State and two private lots) along SR-118 within the project limits, totaling 463 parking spaces. A multidisciplinary team was formed by Caltrans to determine how to expand the Park and Ride Program to better integrate these facilities into the State’s transportation system. The purpose of the program is to identify the existing park and ride resources throughout Caltrans and determine how to transform these resources into more effective networks of park and ride facilities throughout California. One goal of the team is the creation of the tools needed to raise the visibility and improve the viability of park and ride lots in California.

Ventura County is served by seven public fixed-route bus operators, five public dial-a-ride operators, and four paratransit services for seniors and people with disabilities. Ventura County is also served by two Los Angeles-based bus operators (LA Metro and LA DOT), two rail operations (Metrolink and Amtrak), and several private carriers that serve portions of the county. These services are funded and operated by the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC), the Gold Coast Transit District, the County of Ventura and individual cities within the county.

DATE: November 17, 2017  
ATTN: Mrs. Susan Tse  
FROM: Steve LaRochelle  
RE: Soundwall #5 in SIMI VALLEY, CA

Dear Susan,

I am writing to ask that the above named soundwall project (#5) be considered as a priority as the traffic noise from the freeway is very noisy, even at nighttime.

We have double paned windows and it's still quite loud.

Thanks,



Steve LaRochelle

Simi Valley

805-624-7568

**Response(s) to Comment GP-6**  
**Steve LaRochelle**

As part of the proposed project, a soundwall is proposed along the edge of shoulder on the eastbound SR-118 from Galena Ave. to Tapo Canyon Road. This proposed 12 ft. high soundwall is predicted to provide 5 – 8 decibels of noise reduction to the impacted areas south of SR-118.

A 5 dBA noise reduction is considered to be readily perceptible while a 3 dBA change is considered barely noticeable. A difference in 10 dBA is considered doubling or halving of noise.

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is the funding agency for this widening project. Noise abatement measures have been considered and proposed in the form of sound walls because of the noise impacts created by this project. VCTC is also the funding agency for the retrofit sound wall projects, in which only sound walls are designed and constructed for qualified residential areas.

**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse.Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar J@DOT](mailto:Moreno.Cesar.J@DOT); [Laurel, Christopher@DOT](mailto:Laurel.Christopher@DOT)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Comment on widening the 118 Freeway  
**Date:** Friday, November 17, 2017 11:40:31 AM

Susan Tse

**From:** tnthodgins@roadrunner.com <tnthodgins@roadrunner.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 17, 2017 11:00:02 AM  
**To:** Tse, Susan@DOT  
**Subject:** Comment on widening the 118 Freeway

Hi Susan,  
I attended the meeting last night at the Simi Valley City Hall on widening the 118 freeway. I did not turn in a comment card because I wanted to discuss it with my husband and mull over all the information we received. Our concern is not the widening of the freeway as we are retired and we know when not to use the freeway. Our real concern is the soundwalls. Several years ago Caltrans put a noise detector in our neighbors back yard. They placed it on a short retaining wall next to a full grown row of Italian Cypress trees. After a week they collected the detector and said the noise level was not high enough to warrant a soundwall. Of course the noise level was lower due to the trees blocking the sound. If they had come to my backyard next door the sound would of been extremely higher as we have no sound barriers. We have lived her for 43 years and have had to put up with the awaking sounds of the freeway in the morning and the undesirable sounds in the afternoon and evening in our back yard. Thanks to our installed double pained windows, the freeway noise is not too bad in the house while the windows are closed. Our bedroom is on the second floor and we usually have the window open for fresh (?) air. However, there is a place on the freeway eastbound where there is a bump in the slow lane that trucks hit while going 65+ and it makes a terrible rumbling noise. It can wake us up from a deep sleep. They have tried to repair this several times but it comes back. At times we think it is an earthquake as it shakes our house it is so loud. Don't know if a soundwall would help that but it's worth trying.  
Again, we really don't care if you widen the freeway. We are interested in getting a soundwall for our neighborhood, between Tapo Canyon Rd and Galena on the South side of the 118, even if you don't widen the freeway.  
Thank you for you consideration,  
Terry Hodgins  
2478 Castlemont Court  
Simi Valley, CA 93063

**Response(s) to Comment GP-7**  
**Terry Hodgins**

As part of the proposed project, a soundwall is proposed along the edge of shoulder on the eastbound SR-118 from Galena Ave. to Tapo Canyon Road. This proposed 12 ft. high soundwall is predicted to provide 5 – 8 decibels of noise reduction to the impacted areas south of SR-118.

A 5 dBA noise reduction is considered to be readily perceptible while a 3 dBA change is considered barely noticeable. A difference in 10 dBA is considered doubling or halving of noise.

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is the funding agency for this widening project. Noise abatement measures have been considered and proposed in the form of sound walls because of the noise impacts created by this project. VCTC is also the funding agency for the retrofit sound wall projects, in which only sound walls are designed and constructed for qualified residential areas.



**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse,Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar J@DOT](mailto:Moreno,Cesar.J@DOT)  
**Cc:** [Laurel, Christopher@DOT](mailto:Laurel.Christopher@DOT)  
**Subject:** FW: Sound Wall 118 Freeway at Tapo Canyon Exit  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 21, 2017 12:33:27 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you and have a good day!

**SUSAN TSE, MPH, MS**  
Senior Environmental Planner  
-  
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION-DISTRICT 7**  
**Division of Environmental Planning**  
100 S. Main Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA, 90012  
Telephone: (213) 897-1821  
Fax: (213) 897-0685

---

**From:** Chris Lazenby [mailto:chris@ckstech.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 21, 2017 11:15 AM  
**To:** Tse, Susan@DOT <susan.tse@dot.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Sound Wall 118 Freeway at Tapo Canyon Exit  
**Importance:** High

Hi Susan,

I got your information from the City of Simi Valley. I was just notified about the widening of the 118 freeway from Tapo Canyon to Moorpark.

We live in Simi Valley, Ca at

4091 Eve Rd  
Simi Valley, CA 93063

We purchased this property about 4 years ago and at that time our front yard was blocked from the freeway by trees and bushes.

Over the last 2 years the Caltrans crews have come in and removed the majority of the trees and bushes, giving us a direct view to both the freeway and the off ramp.

The noise level has increased dramatically as well since there is no longer that buffer there.

**Response(s) to Comment GP-8**  
**Chris Lazenby**

Please note that, based on research, trees do not provide a noticeable noise reduction unless they are about 100 ft. deeply dense and at least 15 ft. above the line of sight. Generally, the trees provide an “out of sight, out of mind” psychological benefit, but not an acoustic benefit.

This existing soundwall in front of your residence was constructed first, as part of the phase one project which extended from Tapo Canyon Rd. to the Los Angeles County Line, and second, in order to provide adequate noise reduction to homes south of Eve Rd. Based on the noise study for the phase one project, your residence did not qualify for noise abatement consideration as no noise impacts were identified there. All impacted areas as part of that project (Phase I) were adequately abated by the soundwalls.

Because your residence is outside the scope of the project limits for the current proposed project, we regret to inform you that it does not warrant additional noise study or consideration of extension to the existing wall.

I am requesting consideration for the extension of the current sound wall to extend along the westbound Tapo Canyon off Ramp.

We live adjacent to the westbound Tapo Canyon exit ramp off the 118 freeway in Simi Valley.


Please contact me directly with any questions.

Thank you


Chris Lazenby  
(818)631-2724

**Response(s) to Comment GP-8**  
**Chris Lazenby**

See previous page.



COMMENT CARD  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
SR-118 WIDENING PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING  
November 16, 2017



NAME: J. PAUL KOZAK      DATE: 11/30/2017  
ADDRESS: 2522 Orangewood Place      PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Simi Valley, CA 93065-2374  
E-MAIL ADDRESS: paulk@ieee.org

(CIRCLE YOUR POSITION)

I AM

OPPOSED

IN FAVOR

NEUTRAL

(see attached)

I don't support any sort of expansion without the soundwalls being erected first. If the soundwalls are not first erected, we will likely end up with asymmetric soundwalls along the 118 similar to what happened with the last 118 expansion in Simi Valley. While it may be poorer for air quality, slower traffic is safer traffic from the standpoint of fewer vehicles accidentally leaving the freeway along the shoulders where there are not soundwalls, just guard rails, especially with all the distracted drivers texting, etc, in a dense traffic situation. Slower traffic is also generally quieter traffic.

To explain what I mean by asymmetric soundwalls, my residence is located along the South side of 118, between Erringer and Sycamore, where soundwall S3 is to be installed under either of the two Build Alternatives. What happened during the previous freeway expansion was a soundwall was erected on the North side of the freeway and money ran out to erect the corresponding soundwall on the south side of the freeway (the proposed S3 soundwall). The neighborhood lobbied hard at that time to at least make the North Soundwall absorptive instead of reflective, but a reflective soundwall was ultimately built on the North side, resulting in at least a 3 dB increase in noise along the South side on an average basis, and much larger increases in the peak, non-average, noise levels, such as a straight-pipe Harley under wide-open acceleration going up the freeway on-ramp, or under heavy acceleration after being stopped at the ramp meter to match the freeway speeds and merge in. The noise situation was further exacerbated by the removal of mature vegetation along the freeway shoulders, median, and ramps.

Installing soundwalls as a first priority will also greatly mitigate the construction noise and also constrain vehicles from leaving the freeway shoulders where there are not presently soundwalls due to the inevitable increase in accidents within the construction zones.

These soundwalls should be matched to the height of the existing soundwalls in my opinion, where one side of the freeway already has an existing soundwall, to minimize the increase in noise "spillage" along the side with the lower height soundwall.

To summarize, I am only in favor of the No Build Alternative if soundwalls are not FIRST erected in either of the two Build Alternatives. This approach will also solve the inevitable funding constraint problem that occurs when actual cost of the work performed on the project exceeds the proposed cost that contractors submit to win the project. The last thing that I want to end up with is an expanded freeway without soundwalls that allows higher speeds and a more frequent occurrence of cars and trucks accidentally exiting the freeway's shoulders and ending up in residents' backyards, or worse, in people's homes.

Response(s) to Comment GP-9  
J. Paul Kozak

Your recommendation has been incorporated as a construction noise minimization measure as follows, “Where practical, feasible, and reasonable, proposed soundwalls shall be constructed in the beginning of the project as a means of minimizing any impact on the sensitive receptors”.

As part of the proposed project, a soundwall is proposed along the edge of shoulder on the eastbound SR-118 between Erringer Road and Sycamore Drive. This proposed 12 ft. high soundwall is predicted to provide 7 – 8 decibels of noise reduction to adjacent residences south of SR-118.

A 5 dBA noise reduction is considered to be readily perceptible while a 3 dBA change is considered barely noticeable. A difference in 10 dBA is considered doubling or halving of noise.

Please note that based on research, while reflective barriers can result in increase in noise levels on the other side, this increase is not discernible to the average human ears. Also, trees do not provide a noticeable noise reduction unless they are about 100 ft. deeply dense and at least 15 ft. above the line of sight. Generally, the trees provide an “out of sight, out of mind” psychological benefit, but not an acoustic benefit.

**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse.Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar J@DOT](mailto:Moreno.Cesar.J@DOT); [Laurel, Christopher@DOT](mailto:Laurel.Christopher@DOT)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 118 Freeway CalTrans SoundWall in Ventura County  
**Date:** Friday, December 01, 2017 4:21:27 PM

Susan Tse

**From:** Chris Lazenby <[chris@ckstech.com](mailto:chris@ckstech.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 1, 2017 4:13:44 PM  
**To:** Tse, Susan@DOT  
**Subject:** 118 Freeway CalTrans SoundWall in Ventura County

Hi Susan,

We live in Simi Valley, Ca at:

4091 Eve Rd  
Simi Valley, CA 93063

We purchased this property about 4 years ago and at that time our front yard was blocked from the freeway by trees and bushes.

Over the last 2 years the Caltrans crews have come in and removed the majority of the trees and bushes, giving us a direct view to both the freeway and the off ramp.

The noise level has increased dramatically as well since there is no longer that buffer there.

I understand they are widening the 118 freeway beginning at Tapo Canyon, this will most definitely increase the noise and traffic that is in direct sight of our home.

I am requesting consideration for the extension of the current sound wall which ends at the beginning of our property bordering the freeway.

We live adjacent to the westbound Tapo Canyon exit ramp off the 118 freeway in Simi Valley.

Please contact me directly with any questions.

Thank you

Chris Lazenby  
4091 Eve Rd  
Simi Valley, CA 93063  
818-631-2724

**Response(s) to Comment G-10**  
**Chris Lazenby**

Please note that, based on research, trees do not provide a noticeable noise reduction unless they are about 100 ft. deeply dense and at least 15 ft. above the line of sight. Generally, the trees provide an “out of sight, out of mind” psychological benefit, but not an acoustic benefit.

This existing soundwall in front of your residence was constructed first, as part of the phase one project which extended from Tapo Canyon Rd. to the Los Angeles County Line, and second, in order to provide adequate noise reduction to homes south of Eve Rd. Based on the noise study for the phase one project, your residence did not qualify for noise abatement consideration as no noise impacts were identified there. All impacted areas as part of that project (Phase I) were adequately abated by the soundwalls.

Because your residence is outside the scope of the project limits for the current proposed project, we regret to inform you that it does not warrant additional noise study or consideration of extension to the existing wall.



**From:** [Tse, Susan@DOT](mailto:Tse.Susan@DOT)  
**To:** [Moreno, Cesar I@DOT](mailto:Moreno.Cesar_I@DOT); [Laurel, Christopher@DOT](mailto:Laurel.Christopher@DOT)  
**Subject:** FW: Ven-118 Widening Project  
**Date:** Friday, December 01, 2017 10:27:36 AM

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you and have a good day!

**SUSAN TSE, MPH, MS**  
Senior Environmental Planner

-  
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION-DISTRICT 7**  
Division of Environmental Planning  
100 S. Main Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA, 90012  
Telephone: (213) 897-1821  
Fax: (213) 897-0685

**From:** danny estrada [mailto:dannye71@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 1, 2017 9:20 AM  
**To:** Tse, Susan@DOT <susan.tse@dot.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Ven-118 Widening Project

Hello Mrs. Susan Tse,

My name is Danny Estrada, I had the opportunity to attend and speak at the public hearing for Ven-118 Widening Project on November 16th, 2017 at the City of Simi Valley Council Chambers. I would like to start by thanking everyone involved for giving the residents of Simi Valley an opportunity to be heard and be a part of this project. I am hoping our recommendations and requests are truly heard and considered and not just a formality.

In my opinion, the majority of residents who attended including myself, were primarily focused on the "Constructing of the Soundwalls" for both Safety and Noise concerns. In reviewing the Initial Study / Environmental Assessment, alternatives 2 and 3 outline the several Phases of work scheduled to begin 8 years from now (2025) and to span over a period of 10 years (2025-2035), which is way to far into the future for many of us. In effort to make it a reality sooner rather than later, I recommend seeking **"Funding in Phases"** i.e., funding for **"Soundwalls First"** then the mix flow lanes/paving the median then the widening structures, etc. versus seeking the FULL amount of funding needed for Alternative #2 \$173,000,000 and Alternative #3 \$129,000,000. By doing this, you achieve many positive results:

- You could potentially start sooner rather than in 2025

**If Soundwalls are Constructed First:**

- It immediately creates a safety barrier that eliminates the risk of vehicles potentially crashing into residents homes and yards (as has happened).

**Response(s) to Comment GP-11**  
**Danny Estrada**

As part of the proposed project, Caltrans has identified noise impacted areas and has proposed soundwalls under both build alternatives at 5 locations, which are listed in Table 41 and shown in Figures 25 through 31. Please note that soundwalls are constructed only to reduce noise to the adjacent impacted communities, not for safety.

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is the funding agency for this widening project. Noise abatement measures have been considered and proposed in the form of sound walls because of the noise impacts created by this project. VCTC is also the funding agency for the retrofit sound wall projects, in which only sound walls are designed and constructed for qualified residential areas.

Your recommendation has been incorporated as a construction noise minimization measure as follows, “Where practical, feasible, and reasonable, proposed soundwalls shall be constructed in the beginning of each project phase as a means of minimizing any impact on the sensitive receptors”.



- Immediately relieves a major issues that many residents have been concerned with.
- You will have more content and cooperative residents.
- Residents would only have to deal with noise associated with the construction of the soundwalls itself not all of the construction.
- It reduces current road noise.
- It will reduce future construction noise.
- It will reduce future increased road noise from the added lanes.

If Soundwalls are Constructed last:

- Residents still continue to be at risk of vehicles potentially crashing into their home and yard.
- Discontent and Uncooperative residents.
- Residents will have to continue to deal with current road noise.
- Residents will have to deal with the construction noise.
- Residents will have to deal with the increased road noise from the added lanes.
- Residents will then still have to deal with the noise from the construction of soundwalls.

I sincerely hope our recommendations and requests are heard and considered.

If you have any questions or would like further input please feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience.

FYI, I have been in the Construction for close to 30 years and have a good sense of what it takes to get projects completed.

Thank you for your time,

Danny Estrada  
626-674-3276  
[dannye71@yahoo.com](mailto:dannye71@yahoo.com)

**Response(s) to Comment GP-11**  
**Danny Estrada**

See previous page.